

Bat Emergence Report

Dyson Hall

Report prepared for:
Willmott Dixon Construction Limited
Hollinwood Business Centre
Albert Mill
Albert Street
Hollinwood
Oldham
Lancashire OL8 3QL

Prepared by:
Simon Brain P.G.C.E. (Natural England 2015-17334-CLS-CLS)

02 06 2016

1. Introduction	3
1.1 Site description, location and context	3
1.2 Proposed works and impact	3
1.3 Purpose, aims and objective of this report	3
2. Methods	4
2.1 Summary of survey methods	4
2.2 Pre Survey data search	4
2.3 Surveyor information	4
3. Emergence Survey Results	5
3.1 Dusk emergence results	5-8
4. Constraints and legislation	8
4.1 Constraints on survey information or equipment	8
4.2 Potential impacts of development	8
4.3 Legislation and Policy guidance	8
5. Recommendations and mitigation	8
5.1 Further survey	8
5.2 Mitigation measures	9
5.3 Mitigation licenses	9
6. Recommendations and mitigation / compensation	9
6.1 Summary	9

Appendix 1 Surveyor positions

1. Introduction

1.1 Site description, location and context

The site comprises of a large recently constructed Local Authority building formerly serving the H.M. Prison service. It has residential units, woodland, scattered trees and Local Nature Reserve (mainly grassland) surrounding it on all sides.

We understand there is a complete demolition of the main building which is due to take place for a new educational development as shown on Dyson Hall redevelopment plans Rev2 22.05.2016. It is not known at this time when the works will be implemented.

1.3 Purpose, aims and objectives of this report

A preliminary roost assessment (internal and external hand search and report of the building) was carried out on the 24.05.2016. This report concluded a low potential was present within the building but the and recommended a dusk emergence survey to be carried out to establish presence or absence and inform mitigation proposals. The 24.05.16 report indicated two areas of potential use, firstly the top of western elevations where numerous loose fascia boarding is present and the main atrium area where the highest masonry elevation is present/loose fascia boards.

The purpose of this report is therefore to establish use of the building by bats by means of a dusk emergence survey at the identified points of potential entry or shelter for bat species.

We shall aim to:

- Establish absence or presence on the development site with particular reference to the use of the building by bats.

The objective of the report is to be able to assess the bat use in the building, the impact of construction and any applicable mitigation measures in relation to the extent and use of the site by bats.

2. Methods

2.1 Summary of survey methods

The BCT January 2016 good practice survey guidelines shall be used to design and inform the survey effort with particular regard to section 7.1 page 49-52.

The BCT January 2016 good practice survey guidelines recommend a minimum survey effort for buildings with low potential to support roosting bats of one dusk emergence and / or one pre-dawn re-entry survey. Therefore one dusk emergence survey was undertaken on the 02.06.16 commencing at 21.00, sunset at 21.28pm.

During the survey three surveyors were positioned to observe Potential Roost Features identified in the initial preliminary roost assessment dated 24.05.2016 and as shown in Appendix One . The surveyors remained in place 30 minutes before sunset and for 2 hours after. The survey was undertaken in good weather conditions with no rain and temperatures well above 10 degree and during the optimal season for bat activity. Survey commenced at 21.00, sunset at 21.28 and survey finished at 23.28.

Generally the surveyors record weather and all bat activity including the number of bats emerging / passes, species detected, behaviour for example feeding or commuting, flight direction and any relevant comments. Each surveyor used an Echo Meter Touch and a BatBox Duet/Elekon detector. There were no weather or HS related constraints and all bats were detectable with the equipment used.

Each surveyor was placed so as to have an unobstructed view of elevations on the building to as to be able to view all parts of the potential roost features.

2.2 Pre Survey data search

No Local Records Center data was obtained.

2.3 Surveyor information

Simon Brain (Managing Director) has attained a Post Graduate Certificate in Biological Recording and has attended FSC Field Courses for Land mammals, Songbird identification, Barn Owls (CIEEM) and Advanced Bird Survey Techniques (Level M). He has four years experience in bat and avian work. He has accumulated over 350 hours of bat contact time and holds an NE Class 2 license (70619:OTH:CSAB:2016). He has attended courses for trees and bats, bat survey

techniques, bat handling, bat mitigation and attended two European workshops ran by Greena Ecology. Dawn Goodfellow is a senior ecologist with four years experience of bats. Jack Mallinder is a BSc (Conservation and ecology) student and has been listening and recording bats for two years under the guidance of Simon Brain.

3. Emergence Survey - Results

3.1 Dusk emergence results

Surveyor positions

Simon Brain was positioned at the main atrium/masonry elevation. Dawn Goodfellow was located at the northern end of the western elevation and Jack Mallinder was located at the southern end of the western elevation.

Summary

No bats were seen to emerge from the building and it was considered that bats and bat roosts were absent from the building.

A single bat species (Common Pipistrelle) was recored during the survey. The species was observed to commute over the site feeding and foraging.

Bats emerged at typical times for the species and both surveyors located on the western elevation identified these bats moments after each other, confirming the record and the general behaviour.

The common pipistrelles were first visually seen foraging around the trees growing on the western boundary

Detailed survey records

Simon Brain

22.08 47Khz – common pipistrelle not seen

22.25 45Khz – common pipistrelle passed heading south, visual.

22.35 46Khz – common pipistrelle passed heading north

22.51 45Khz – common pipistrelle not seen, feint record

23.16 47Khz – common pipistrelle not seen, feint call.

23.18 45Khz – common pipistrelle pass

Jack Mallinder

21:56, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, heading south along the west facing elevation.

22:01, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, heading north along the west facing elevation before turning around and heading back towards the trees.

22:17, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle x2, possible feeding buzz as they circled above head, one proceeded south, the other went north along the west facing elevation.

22:23, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, headed north along the west facing wall before double backing south twice at the 9th window from the corner where the west face and south facing elevation, proceeded north along the elevation shortly afterwards.

22:26, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, came from southern treeline heading north along the west facing external. Seen again at 22:27 exhibiting the same flight path in reverse.

22:32, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, feeding buzz at the corner of the west facing elevation as it circled, then proceeded south.

22:34, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, headed south along the west facing elevation.

22:35, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, headed north along the west facing elevation then turned around midway back to the trees on the south side.

22:37, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, distant call, no visual.

22:38, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, headed south along the elevation, circled the trees and bushes on the south side of the building.

22:39, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, headed north then south along the elevation, feeding buzz at the south end of the elevation.

22:42, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, feeding buzz at the beginning of the observation, headed north after then back to south along the west facing elevation.

22:44, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, headed north along the elevation from the southern tree line.

22:57, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, circled the corner of the building three times before heading north.

23:03, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, distant call, no visual.

23:13, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, distant call, no visual.

23:23, 46 KHz- common pipistrelle, no visual.

Dawn Goodfellow

21:56, first bat (C. pip) heard/seen, came from around corner of Dyson Hall, circled twice between Jack and myself and the building and the trees and then passed over Jack and was lost from view.

22:17, 2 bats (both C. pip) heard/seen, came from LNR end of building over Jack and towards me, 1 passed over me and went around corner of Dyson Hall, the other flew other side of trees and was lost from view.

22:24, one bat (C. pip) heard/seen, from Jack's direction, again it flew away around the corner of the building.

22:34, one bat (C. pip) heard/seen, came from around the corner of Dyson Hall and flew towards Jack before lost from view.

22:42, one bat (C.Pip), heard not seen, feint pass

22:44, one bat (C.Pip) feeding and foraging around trees adjacent to Dyson Hall Lane.

23:04, one bat (C.Pip), not seen.

23:15, one bat (C.Pip) passed overhead travelling north around building

23:24, one bat pass (C.Pip) not seen.

Analysis

Simon Brain recorded comparably low levels of activity from his position (A) on the eastern elevation of the building. The peak of activity came from Jack Mallinders position (C) with Dawn Goodfellow's position (B) also having a comparably high number of bat records which were all recorded on the western boundary. The position C, is closest to the Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and received the most activity, from position C, 14 records were made, this was attributed to approximately 3-4 bats in total. Many of the records made in this position were confirmed by the adjacent position (B) which assists in confirming the total number of animals present in the area, as many records were seen visually.

Overall activity was most evidenced close to the LNR and all activity was attributed to commuting and foraging around the trees and building itself. No bats were seen to emerge from the building.

4. Constraints and legislation

4.1 Constraints on survey information or equipment

It was considered that no constraints were applicable and all areas of potential roost feature were adequately viewed. .

4.2 Potential impacts of development

All UK bat species and their roosts (occupied or unoccupied) are legally protected and demolition of a roost site is a criminal offence.

4.3 Legislation and Policy guidance

All bats are European Protected Species as defined by Bern and Bonn Conventions, Conservation of Habitats and Species regulations 2010, Habitats Directive Annex 4, some are also Annex 2.

All bats are protected by domestic legislation including Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended, CROW and NERC Act 2006.

5. Recommendations and mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures

5.1 Further survey effort

Absence of bats has been established by means of this emergence survey and therefore further surveys such as a 'roost characterisation or dawn back track' are not required in accordance with the BCT good practice guidelines February 2016.

5.2 Mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures

As no bats were recorded in the building and therefore no measures are required to mitigate the effects of development on bats in this instance or to compensate for their presence.

However given the presence of potential roost features in the building it is possible bats may roost in the building in the future in the active season. Therefore if development works are delayed beyond the 2017 summer months, it will be necessary to resurvey the building and carry out a repeat emergence survey to confirm absence.

As bat activity on site was purely commuting which did include foraging there is a requirement under the National Planning Policy Framework for habitat enhancement measures to be included into this scheme that are specific to bats. These measures shall be drawn up within a biodiversity enhancement scheme for the sites re development. This shall also draw on the Extended Phase 1 survey and the Great Crested Newt Survey reports compiled for this site.

5.3 Mitigation licenses

There are no requirements for mitigation licensing as there is no requirement for anyone to carry out activity prohibited under wildlife legislation.

6. Summary

6.1 No bats were found to emerge from the building. As a result no measures are required to mitigate the effects of development on bats and there is no requirement for an EPS license (derogation or low impact) from Natural England in this instance.

6.2 Under the National Planning Policy Framework the LPA have a duty to seek out biodiversity enhancements and a biodiversity enhancement measures scheme is required.

